



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/875,865	06/07/2001	Mark Andrew Benny	AUS9-2001-0208-US1	9366

7590 07/27/2005
Kelly K. Kordzik
5400 Renaissance Tower
1201 Elm Street
Dallas, TX 75270

EXAMINER

FREJD, RUSSELL WARREN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2128

DATE MAILED: 07/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/875,865

Applicant(s)

BENNY ET AL.

Examiner

Russell Frejd

Art Unit

2128

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 April 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 25-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 25-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

In re Application of: Benny et al.

Examination of Application #09/875,865

1. Claims 25-30 of application 09/875,865, filed on 7-June-2001, are presented for examination. Claims 1-24 were cancelled by applicant's amendment received 29-April-2005.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:
Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefore, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.
- 2.1 Method claim 25 is rejected for reciting a process that is not directed to the technological arts. This claim is directed at a method for using an enterprise service delivery technical model to develop a technical framework to provide Systems Management services to a customer. To be statutory, the utility of an invention must be within the technological arts. *In re Musgrave*, 167 USPQ 280, 289-90 (CCPA, 1970). The definition of "technology" is the "application of science and engineering to the development of machines and procedures in order to enhance or improve human conditions, or at least to improve human efficiency in some respect." (Computer Dictionary 384 (Microsoft Press, 2d ed.1994)). The limitations recited in claim 25 contain no language suggesting that claim 25 is intended to be within the technological arts. However, please note the method steps of claim 25 recited as part of a "computer-implemented method" would be considered as directed to the technological arts.

In re Application of: Benny et al.

Double Patenting Rejections

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.3218 may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3.1 Claims 25 and 28 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 22-25 of U.S. Patent Application No. 09/876,090. This is a provisional rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the present invention is directed to a method for using an enterprise service delivery technical model to develop a technical framework to provide Systems Management services to a customer, and the application is directed to a method for

In re Application of: Benny et al.

creating a technical framework for use in delivering a specific set of information technology services for a customer (Claim 22 preamble). Furthermore, the claims noted above of the present invention and the application are each directed to concepts for determining a solution scope, mapping existing customer information to architectural building blocks of a service delivery technical model, and designating relationships between design objects as a function of the Systems Management solution scope. For at least these reasons, one of ordinary skill would have found it obvious that the concepts for using an enterprise service delivery technical model to develop a technical framework to provide Systems Management services to a customer of the present invention, and creating a technical framework for use in delivering a specific set of information technology services for a customer as in the application, are not patentably distinct in so far as the specifications of each application support the identical critical features noted above.

3.2 Claims 25 and 28 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 and 16-23 of U.S. Patent Application No. 09/875,863. This is a provisional rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the present invention is directed to a method for using an enterprise service delivery technical model to develop a technical framework to provide Systems Management services to a customer, and the application is directed to a method for designing an enterprise service delivery technical framework for a customer (Claim 1 preamble). Furthermore, the claims noted above of the present invention and the application are each directed to concepts for determining a solution scope, mapping existing customer information to architectural building blocks of a service delivery technical model, and designating relationships

In re Application of: Benny et al.

between design objects as a function of the Systems Management solution scope. For at least these reasons, one of ordinary skill would have found it obvious that the concepts for using an enterprise service delivery technical model to develop a technical framework to provide Systems Management services to a customer of the present invention, and designing an enterprise service delivery technical framework for a customer as in the application, are not patentably distinct in so far as the specifications of each application support the identical critical features noted above.

3.3 Claims 25-30 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6, 11-16 and 21-26 of U.S. Patent Application No. 09/876,013. This is a provisional rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the present invention is directed to a method for using an enterprise service delivery technical model to develop a technical framework to provide Systems Management services to a customer, and the application is directed to a method for creating a technical model for use in developing a delivery framework based on an enterprise service delivery technical framework for operating a customer's information technology systems (Claim 1 preamble). Furthermore, the claims noted above of the present invention and the application are each directed to concepts for mapping existing customer information to architectural building blocks of a service delivery technical framework, and designating relationships between design objects as a function of the customer environment. For at least these reasons, one of ordinary skill would have found it obvious that the concepts for using an enterprise service delivery technical model to develop a technical framework to provide Systems

In re Application of: Benny et al.

Management services to a customer of the present invention, and creating a technical model for use in developing a delivery framework based on an enterprise service delivery technical framework for operating a customer's information technology systems, are not patentably distinct in so far as the specifications of each application support the identical critical features noted above.

Examiner's Remarks

4. Claims 25-30 are deemed allowable over the prior art of record at this time, pending resolution of the 101 rejections noted above.

Response Guidelines

5. A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire **3 (three) months and 0 (zero) days** from the date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned (see MPEP 710.02, 710.02(b)).

5.1 Any response to the Examiner in regard to this non-final action should be

directed to: Russell Frejd, telephone number (571) 272-3779, Monday-Friday from 0530 to 1400 ET, or the examiner's supervisor, Jean Homere, telephone number (571) 272-3780. Inquires of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC2100 Group Receptionist (571) 272-2100.

mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

or faxed to: (571) 273-8300

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to the Customer Service Window, Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA, 22314.

Date: 25-July-2005



**RUSSELL FREJD
PRIMARY EXAMINER**